

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING MAY AS NATIONAL CANCER RESEARCH MONTH

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 2011

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for May as National Cancer Research Month. Cancer research is a vital part of our Nation's biomedical research enterprise, and this research both improves the quality of life of our Nation's citizens and generates new economic investment. Cancer research is vital to the community I serve in western New York, home to our country's first comprehensive cancer center, Roswell Park Cancer Institute.

The classic view of innovation is that government funds basic science while industry comes up with new and innovative products based on that science. To make this model work best, it requires a sustained commitment to cancer research at the National Institutes of Health and National Cancer Institute. When federal cancer research funding is cut or not sustained over the long term, we lose promising cancer research and talented cancer researchers. After doubling funding between the years 1998 and 2003, research funding has flat-lined, and it has decreased substantially if you take into account medical inflation.

By and large, our country's investment in innovation in biomedical research has worked well. Over the past 40 years, 153 new FDA approved drugs and vaccines have been discovered through research carried out at public institutions with federal funds. In the last 20 years alone, one out of every five important medical advances approved by the Food and Drug Administration was invented in a federally funded laboratory. Those inventions, which included 40 new drugs for cancer, are currently generating more than \$100 billion a year in sales for drug and biotechnology firms.

The only failure in research is when you quit or are forced to quit due to lack of funding. National Cancer Research Month provides us a reminder of those risks, and also the immense reward that arrives when promising research alleviates the suffering of cancer patients.

A CALL FOR TRANSPARENCY IN THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 2011

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

[From Forbes Magazine, Mar. 28, 2011]

WHAT'S THE REAL DEFENSE BUDGET?

(By Mallory Factor)

The new Congress won the election by promising to cut spending, and

unsurprisingly the defense budget is on the table for the first time in more than a decade.

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates recently announced \$78 billion in defense spending cuts over the next five years, including reductions in troop levels for the Army and Marine Corps. These types of cuts suggest that the military is working to become leaner and more efficient. Still, many Americans and congressmen are calling for deeper cuts.

Not counting the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Defense budget is expected to be \$553 billion in 2012, up from \$549 billion in 2011. That outlay currently represents 19% of the entire federal budget and over 50% of U.S. discretionary spending; cutting it would go a long way toward reining in government spending. But before further slicing the military budget, Congress must reconsider the military's mission and what activities it should undertake.

The purpose of a large standing army is to provide for our national defense. In essence, the defense budget is an insurance policy that protects the U.S. against threats from other nations and groups. But in recent years a growing percentage of that budget has been spent on activities that don't involve traditional national defense. These include nation-building, policing foreign nations, humanitarian missions and ferrying executive- and legislative-branch leaders and their attendants around the globe. While these activities may be tangentially related to our standing in the world, they do not enhance our war-fighting capabilities; rather they relate more to the success of our foreign policy than to our national defense.

This increase in nondefense missions has been accompanied by a dramatic shift from war-fighting to nation-building. The official White House website now describes the function of the Department of Defense as to "protect national interests through war-fighting, providing humanitarian aid and performing peacekeeping and disaster relief services." Is war-fighting just one among the many functions we want our military to perform?

Rightly or wrongly, we give our military these various assignments because we don't want to pay someone else to do them, and other government entities currently can't. Yet just because our military can do these jobs doesn't mean that it should. Indeed, these assignments shift focus away from the military's core missions: keeping America safe and winning wars.

Right now it is difficult for Congress to determine how much money is spent on protecting the U.S. The "military" budget gives an exaggerated impression of the cost of our national defense. When Congress adds burdens to the military, direct costs like fuel, food and relief supplies may be calculated and expressed in the budget.

But these items are just a small part of these missions, and the larger costs get buried. These hidden costs include recruiting and training extra troops, purchasing and servicing additional equipment, additional layers of bureaucracy, and maintaining and enlarging bases, none of which are separated out in the budget as relating to nondefense missions.

The military's nondefense activities may or may not be warranted, but their total costs must be transparent. If Congress does

not consider these costs separately, traditional defense missions and essential equipment upgrades will be crowded out.

America is a compassionate nation and would surely engage in humanitarian activities even if their true costs were known. But why charge these costs to the defense budget and then hide them? Only by demanding that the military budget be limited to legitimate defense activities can Americans know how many dollars we are actually devoting to our national security.

Some military leaders have privately estimated that if these nondefense-related activities were eliminated or given a separate budget, defense spending could be substantially reduced and at the same time the military's war-fighting capabilities increased. Given this uncertainty, before any additional cuts are made to military spending, Congress must demand transparency with respect to the different roles of our military.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COLONEL GLENN SANDERS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS FAREWELL FROM THE HOUSE DIVISION OF THE ARMY OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 2011

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable public service of Lieutenant Colonel Glenn Sanders as he leaves his post at the House Division of the Army Office of Legislative Liaison.

Lieutenant Colonel Sanders was commissioned as a Field Artillery Officer in the United States Army in 1990 at California State University, San Bernardino.

His first assignment was as a platoon leader in a Lance Missile Battery in Germany. His platoon performed one of the last Lance training missions in Europe prior to the nuclear missile system being decommissioned as part of nuclear weapons reductions agreements.

LtCol Sanders then served with the First Cavalry Division at Fort Hood, Texas. After reassignment to the Second Armored Cavalry Regiment in Fort Polk, Louisiana, he deployed to Haiti in support of Operation Uphold Democracy. His unit helped lay the groundwork for a return to democracy by ensuring security during several key elections.

Among his many duties, LtCol Sanders has also served as a Battalion Training Officer in the 420th Movement Control Battalion, an Assistant Professor of Military Science at North Dakota State University, and the Chief of the Mobilization Division at the Army's Training and Doctrine Command.

In 2009, LtCol Sanders served as a Congressional Fellow with the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. During this time I had the pleasure of working with him as he played a pivotal role in supporting

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.